

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-3-2014	13-CV-03105	(N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>In re: Zydus Unsolicited Fax Litigation ("Zydus")</b>            Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated certain consumer protection statutes. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that Zydus engaged in sending mass junk faxes or fax blasts to unwilling recipients in an effort to market its products.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals or entities in the United States who were sent one or more facsimile advertisements from or on behalf of Defendant Zydus or who own the facsimile machines to which the facsimiles were sent through the date of preliminary approval.</p>	Not set yet	For more information visit:  <a href="http://www.PharmaceuticalsTCPASettlement.com">www.PharmaceuticalsTCPASettlement.com</a>
3-3-2014	11-CV-02448	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Westley v. Oclaro, Inc., et al. ("Oclaro")</b>            Plaintiff alleges that Defendant made false and misleading statements in July and August 2010 in issuing (and then reaffirming) Oclaro's increased revenue and earning guidance for first quarter 2011 ("1Q11") (ended 10-2-2010) and accelerated margin guidance for the calendar year 2010 at the time they were aware of facts seriously undermining the reasonableness of these projections. In July and August 2010, Lead Plaintiff alleges that Defendant also misrepresented to the market the significance of Oclaro's close customer relations by inaccurately boasting that these relationships provided them with knowledge of existing order firmness as well as future customer needs.</p>	Not set yet	For more information call, write or visit:  1800 449-4900 (Ph.)  Rick Nelson Shareholder Relations Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101  <a href="http://www.oclarosettlement.com">www.oclarosettlement.com</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Class Members are all persons who purchased or acquired Oclaro's common stock between 5-6-2010 and 10-28-2010, inclusive.		
3-3-2014	13-CV-11357	(D. Mass.)	<p><b>Elizabeth Christensen v. Sur La Table, Inc.</b> The lawsuit alleges that Sur La Table, Inc. violated Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A by requesting and recording personal identification information in the form of Zip Codes from Massachusetts Sur La Table, Inc. Store customers using a credit card, allegedly in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93 § 105(a).</p> <p>Class Members are all persons with an address in the United States who, between 6-6-2009 and [insert: date of entry of Preliminary Approval Order], used a credit card to make a purchase at a Massachusetts Sur La Table, Inc. Store and whose Personal Identification Information, including, but not limited to, a Zip Code, was provided to and recorded by Sur La Table, Inc. during the transaction.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p><b>Class Action Administration, Inc.</b> 6521 West 91<sup>st</sup> Ave. Westminster, CO 80031</p> <p>720 540-4422 (Ph.)</p>
3-3-2014	13-CV-296	(E.D. Va.)	<p><b>Jeffrey O. Jasper v. Account Control Technology, Inc.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., by sending letters to consumers that contained false or misleading statements regarding the federal student loan rehabilitation program. Specifically, Plaintiff claims that certain letters sent by Defendant were false or misleading because they suggest</p>	6-5-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Brian L. Bromberg</b> Bromberg Law Office, P.C. P.O. box 91 Old Chelsea Station New York, NY 10113</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>that the only way to qualify for the federal student loan rehabilitation program is to make nine consecutive monthly payments, rather than nine payments over a period of ten months.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals with addresses in the United States who: (a) from 5-10-2012 to the present; (b) were sent a collection letter by Defendant; (c) in a form materially identical or substantially similar to the letter sent to the Plaintiff.</p>		
3-4-2014	12-CV-01172	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Jason Trabakoolas, et al. v. Watts Water Technologies, Inc., et al.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Watts Water Technologies, Inc., ("Watts"): 1) designed and sold toilet connectors with defective acetal coupling nuts, 2) knew of the defective condition of the coupling nuts for years before the product was redesigned, 3) provided inadequate installation instructions, and 4) failed to provide warnings to prevent failure of the coupling nuts.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals and entities that own or owned, or lease or leased, a residence or other structure located in the United States containing a "Toilet Connector."</p>	7-16-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Simon Paris Patrick Howard Saltz, Mongeluzzi, Barrett &amp; Bendesky, P.C. 1650 Market Street 52<sup>nd</sup> Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103</p>
3-6-2014	11-CV-02610 11-CV-03120	(E.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Zakskorn v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc. Hidalgo v. Honda Motor Company Ltd.</b></p> <p>The lawsuit asserts that a Honda Civic part was defectively designed, and that as a result the brake pads on some Civics wore out prematurely.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Michael A. Caddell Caddell &amp; Chapman</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Class Members are all residents of the United States, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or Guam and currently own or lease, or previously owned or leased, a Honda Civic, model years 2006-2011 (DX and LX trims only).</p>		<p>The Park in Houston Center 1331 Lamar Suite 1070 Houston, TX 77010</p>
3-6-2014	09-MD-02034	(E.D. Pa.)	<p><b>In re: Comcast Corp. Set-Top Cable Television Box Litigation</b> Plaintiff alleges that Comcast dominates the market for Premium Cable in the areas in which it operates and abuses its power by requiring consumers to use and to rent the set-top boxes that it distributes as a condition of purchasing its Premium Cable services (such as On Demand services, pay-per-view programming, and high definition channels). The lawsuit further claims that by tying the sale of Premium Cable to the rental of its set-top boxes, Comcast has violated antitrust laws by substantially restricting competition in the market for the rental of set-top boxes, enabling Comcast to reap supra-competitive profits from Class members and producing significant adverse effects on interstate commerce.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who, or entities which: (a) have subscribed to Premium Cable in the United States; (b) have paid Comcast a rental fee for a Set-Top Box; (c) have received the Notice provided for in paragraph 4 of this Agreement; and (d) are a Comcast subscriber as of the Effective Date.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or visit:  1 800 517-7479 (Ph.)  <a href="http://www.SetTopBoxSettlement.com">www.SetTopBoxSettlement.com</a></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-7-2014	12-CV-00083	(E.D. Tenn.)	<p><b>In re: Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litigation</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that King and Mutual (1) entered into an unlawful market allocation agreement in which Mutual agreed not to launch a generic version of Skelaxin in the United States in exchange for payments by King; (2) failed to advise a federal court that the dispute between them had been resolved and instead used the pendency of the case to create the false appearance to the court, the FDA, and the Federal Trade Commission that Mutual was vigorously attempting to bring a competing generic drug to market; (3) engaged in a campaign of filing sham petitions with the FDA to delay FDA approval of generic versions of Skelaxin; and (4) pursued sham patent litigation against a generic competitor to enforce an invalid patent.</p> <p>Class Members are all entities in the United States that purchased Skelaxin directly from King Pharmaceuticals, Inc. at any time between 11-4-2005 and [the date the Court certifies the direct Purchaser Settlement Class].</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail:</p> <p>Thomas M. Sobol Lauren Barnes Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP 55 Cambridge Parkway Suite 301 Cambridge, MA 02142</p> <p>617 482-3700 (Ph.)</p> <p><a href="http://www.hbsslaw.com">www.hbsslaw.com</a></p>
3-7-2014	13-CV-01700	(D. Colo.)	<p><b>Robert O'Brien, v. Airport Concessions, Inc., a Colorado Corporation, d/b/a Connections Made EZ</b></p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act ("FACTA") amendment to the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA"). Specifically, Plaintiff claims that the Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681c(g)</p>	6-18-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Thomas A. Zimmerman Jr. Adam M. Tamburelli Frank J. Stretz Zimmerman Law Offices, P.C. 77 W. Washington Street</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>when Plaintiff received from an ACI store a computer-generated cash register receipt which displayed the expiration date of his credit card.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who received an electronically printed receipt at the point of sale or transaction from any Connections Made EZ store located in Denver International Airport or Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, in a transaction occurring after 6-3-2008, which receipt displays the expiration date of the person's credit card or debit card.</p>		<p>Suite 1220 Chicago, IL 60602</p>
3-7-2014	13-CV-03948	(E.D. Pa.)	<p><b>Raymond Gold v. Raymond J. DeHont, Michael J. Morris, Judith A. Spires, Stanley W. Silverman, George H. Glatfelter II and Robin L. Wiessmann, Met-Pro Corporation</b></p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that on 4-22-2013, Met-Pro Corporation ("Met-Pro") and CECO Environmental Corporation ("CECO") announced that they had entered into an Agreement and Plan of Merger (the "Merger Agreement"), dated as of 4-21-2013, pursuant to which, following approval by vote of Met-Pro's shareholders, Met-Pro would be merged with and into CECO, and shareholders of Met-Pro stock could elect to receive \$13.75 in cash and/or shares in CECO common stock, with the overall elections subject to proration such that approximately 53% of Met-Pro shares would be exchanged for cash and 47% for stock (the "Merger").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who owned Met-Pro</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Shane T. Rowley Levi &amp; Korsinsky LLP 30 Broad Street 24<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10004</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			common stock, either of record or beneficially, at any time from and including 4-22-2013, through and including 8-27-2013 including any and all of their respective successors-in-interest, predecessors, representatives, trustees, executors, administrators, heirs, assigns or transferees, immediate and remote, or any person or entity acting for or on behalf of, or claiming under any of them, and each of them.		
3-7-2014	12-CV-05125	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Barbara Fafard v. Apple, Inc., et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that certain iTunes gift cards that were purchased from Best Buy retail stores during the period 9-1-2007 through 12-31-2009 were deactivated and that, as a result, cardholders were unable to receive the full value and benefits of their iTunes gift cards.</p> <p>Class Members include all U.S. residents who currently have iTunes gift cards, or receipts for such gift cards that were: (i) purchased from Best Buy stores between 1-1-2007 and 12-31-2009; (ii) deactivated between 8-1-2010 and 10-31-2010; and (iii) not redeemed by the cardholder.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>William A. Kershaw Stuart C. Talley Kershaw, Cutter &amp; Ratinoff LLP 401 Watt Avenue Sacramento, CA 95864</p> <p>Jonathan Auerbach Jerome M. Marcus Steven Tyson Marcus &amp; Auerbach LLC 101 Greenwood Avenue Suite 310 Jenkintown, PA 19046</p>
3-10-2014	13-CV-03105	(N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>In re Zydus Unsolicited Fax Litigation</b> <b>Scheduled Judicial Hearing Update as of 3-10-2014 (see 3-3-2014 for case details).</b></p>	9-3-2014	<p>For more information visit:</p> <p><a href="http://www.PharmaceuticalsTCPASettlement.com">www.PharmaceuticalsTCPASettlement.com</a></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-10-2014	13-CV-21104	(S.D. Fla.)	<p><b>Lopez v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A., et al.</b>            HSBC Mortgage Corporation (USA), Inc., HSBC Finance Corporation, Beneficial Company LLC, Beneficial Financial I Inc., HFC Company LLC, HSBC Consumer Lending (USA) Inc., HSBC Mortgage Services Inc., Assurant Inc., American Security Insurance Company and Standard Guaranty Insurance Company (collectively, "Defendants").</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that when a borrower was required to have hazard property insurance pursuant to a residential mortgage or home equity loan or line of credit, and the borrower failed to provide evidence of acceptable coverage, Defendants would place hazard insurance in a manner whereby HSBC Bank USA, N.A. and its affiliates (collectively, "HSBC") allegedly received unauthorized benefits from the Defendants issuing the hazard lender-placed insurance ("LPI") policies. Plaintiff also alleges that the way in which LPI policies were obtained and placed caused the rates and the amount of coverage to be excessive.</p> <p>Class Members are all who were charged and still owe, or who paid, HSBC between 1-1-2005 [preliminary hearing date], for a hazard lender-placed insurance policy for residential property.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p>Adam M. Moskowitz,            Tucker Ronzetti            Rachel Sullivan            Robert J. Neary            Kozyak, Tropin &amp;            Throckmorton P.A.            2525 Ponce de Leon Blvd.            9<sup>th</sup> Floor            Coral Gables, FL 33134</p> <p>305 372-1800 (Ph.)</p> <p>305 37203508 (Fax)</p>
3-11-2014	10-CV-14046	(E.D. Mich.)	<p><b>Allan, et al. v. Realcomp II Ltd., et al.</b>            Plaintiffs allege that Defendants conspired to restrain the ability of certain real estate</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more informaiton Write to:</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>brokers to compete in the area served by Realcomp II Multiple Listing Services (MLS), which includes the counties of Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, and Livingston. It is further alleged that by limiting the ability of certain brokerages to compete effectively for real estate listing, Defendants were able to maintain commission rates in the entire Realcomp II MLS service area at artificially high levels.</p> <p>Class Members are purchasers of Exclusive Right To Sell real estate brokerage services for residential properties in the Realcomp MLS Service Area from 5-1-2004 through 4-27-2007.</p>		<p>Todd Mendel Barris Sott Denn &amp; Driker PLLC 211 W. Fort Street 15<sup>th</sup> Floor Detroit, MI 48226</p>
3-12-2014	13-CV-00172	(D. Neb.)	<p><b>Cullan and Cullan LLC v. m-Qube, Inc.</b> Plaintiff alleges claims for damages and injunctive relief against Mobile Massager Americas, Inc., m-Qube, Inc., and CF Enterprises Pty. Ltd., arising out of alleged unsolicited text messages sent from Premium Shortcodes related to Mobile Content, such as ring-tones, news and information alerts, and other digital and electronic content to wireless telephone subscribers, and the sale and billing of allegedly unauthorized Mobile Content to wireless telephone subscribers.</p> <p>The Settlement Class is defined as: all current and former Wireless Subscribers Nationwide, who: (a) at any time from 1-1-2010, to the Notice Date, incurred any charge, whether paid or not, associated with any of the programs set forth; or (b) at any time from 1-31-2011, to the Notice</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Ben Barnow Barnow and Associates, P.C. 1 N. LaSalle Street Suite 4600 Chicago, IL 60602</p> <p>312 621-2000 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			Date, received any message from any Premium Short Code; or (c) at any time from 1-1-2010, to the Notice Date, received any message from a Premium Short Code registered at the CTIA to (i) any organization recognized as exempt from federal income taxation under I.R.C. § 501(c) (3) or I.R.C. § 501(c) (4), or (ii) federal political committees registered with the Federal Election Commission.		
3-11-2014	09-MD-02063	(D. Colo.)	<p><b>In re: Oppenheimer Rochester Funds Group Securities Litigation</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the registration statement and prospectuses issued by the Funds during the time periods 5-13-2006 and 10-21-2008, inclusive, misrepresented the funds' risks.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired A, B, C, or Y shares of Rochester Fund Municipals (the "Rochester Fund") during the period from 2-26-2006 through 10-21-2008, inclusive, and were damaged thereby.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Steven J. Toll Cohen Milstein Sellers &amp; Toll PLLC 1100 New York Ave, N.W. Suite 500 West Tower Washington, DC 20005</p>
3-13-2014	07-CV-1078	(E.D. Pa.)	<p><b>Marchbanks Truck Service, Inc., et al. v. Comdata Network, Inc., et al.</b></p> <p>d/b/a (1) Comdata Corporation n/k/a Comdata Inc.; (2) Ceridian Corporation n/k/a Ceridian LLC; (3) Pilot Travel Center LLC and Pilot Corporation; (4) TravelCenter of America LLC and its wholly owned subsidiaries TA Operating LLC f/k/a TA Operating Corporation d/b/a</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write or call:</p> <p>Eric L. Cramer Berger &amp; Montague, P.C. 1622 Locust Street Philadelphia, PA 19103</p> <p>215 875-3000 (Ph.)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>TravelCenter of America, TravelCenter of America Holding Company LLC f/k/a TravelCenter of America, Inc., and Petro Shopping Centers, L.P.; and (5) Love's Travel Stops &amp; Country Stores, Inc. (the "Defendants").</p> <p>This lawsuit is about percentage-based transaction fees charged to Truck Stops and other Retail Fueling Facilities on Comdata Proprietary Transactions. The Plaintiffs claim that Defendants violated federal antitrust laws by engaging in conduct that insulated Comdata from competition with respect to its proprietary over the road ("OTR") Fleet Card, thereby allowing Comdata to charge members of the Settlement Class fees above levels that would have been charged in a competitive market. Plaintiffs claim further that Comdata charged Pilot, TA and Love's lower fees, which afforded them a competitive advantage over members of the Settlement Class, in exchange for the Major Chains' agreeing not to compete with Comdata or support Comdata's rivals in the OTR Fleet Card market.</p> <p>Class Members are all owners and operators of Truck Stops or other Retail Fueling Facilities with at least one physical location in the United States that paid Merchant Transaction Fees directly to Comdata or Comdata Proprietary Transactions and that were calculated based on a percentage of the face amount of the transaction between 3-1-2003 and [Date of Preliminary Approval Order].</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-11-2014	08-CV-01859	(E.D. Mo.)	<p><b>Public Pension Fund Group v. KV Pharmaceutical Company ("KV"), Marc S. Hermeline, and Former Defendants David Van Vliet, and Rita Bleser</b></p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendants and former Defendants violated the federal securities laws. The actions were consolidated into this Action by Order dated 4-28-2009.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly traded securities of KV during the Period between 6-15-2004 and 1-23-2009, inclusive, and were allegedly damaged thereby.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Jonathan M. Plasse Javier Bleichmar Labaton Sucharow LLP 140 Broadway New York, NY 10005</b></p>
3-13-2014	13-CV-00818	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Ari Friedman, et al. v. LAC Basketball Club, Inc.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that defendant LAC sent automated text messages to recipients without their prior express consent.</p> <p>Class Members are all who received at least one (1) unsolicited text message from the Los Angeles Clippers between 2-6-2009 and [Date of Preliminary Approval].</p>	Not set yet	No information
3-13-2014	09-CV-320	(D. Or.)	<p><b>Chehalem Physical Therapy, Inc. and South Whidbey Physical Therapy and Sports Clinic v. Coventry Health Care, Inc.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Coventry incorrectly calculated the reimbursement it owed providers for certain workers' compensation medical bills, under the terms of its First Health PPO Provider</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p><b>Steve D. Larson Joshua L. Ross Stoll Stoll Berne Lokting &amp; Shlachter P.C. 209 s.W. Oak Street</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>Agreement. Specifically, it claims that Coventry incorrectly determines that "maximum amount payable" under workers' compensation rules and guidelines whenever it submits a billed charge for a service that is less than the amount specified for that service under the relevant state's fee schedule. The Plaintiffs claim that Coventry cannot apply a discount (as stated in its provider agreement) to the provider's billed charge if the maximum amount that they can be paid under the state's laws, regulations, rules, and guidelines is the billed charge.</p> <p>Class Members are all who: 1) have or had a First Health provider agreement; 2) that agreement has an Appendix A that uses the term "maximum amount payable" in the language about reimbursement for services provided to occupationally ill or injured employees; and 3) have had bills discounted under the provider agreement from 3-25-1999 to [Date of Preliminary Approval] by Coventry discounting the billed charge when that charge was less than the state or federal fee schedule amount.</p>		<p>Suite 500 Portland, OR 97204</p> <p>503 227-1600 (Ph.)</p> <p>503 227-6840 (Fax)</p>
3-14-2014	13-CV-22882	(S.D. Fla.)	<p><b>John Browning v. Tracfone Wireless, Inc. d/b/a Straight Talk Wireless, Net10 wireless, Simple Mobile and Telcel America and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</b></p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that TracFone and Wal-Mart sold to customers an unlimited service plan for TracFone brand cell phones, but subsequently throttled the data speed, suspended the data</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>usage or terminated the services of such customers prior to the expiration of their service term, which TracFone asserts it had the right to do. The Plaintiff contends that the Defendants violated the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, breached the express warranty in the contract, and were unjustly enriched by their actions.</p> <p>Class Members are all consumers in the United States who purchased and activated a TracFone cell phone or SIM card and/or Activation Kit or Activation Code, including without limitation any Straight Talk, Simple Mobile (including customers both before and after TracFone's acquisition of Simple Mobile on or about 6-18-2012), Net10 and/or Telcel America (collectively "TracFone" branded cell phone, SIM card and/or Activation Kit or Activation Code) and purchased and redeemed an unlimited service plan and whose data usage was Throttled, or Data Usage Suspended or Services Terminated.</p>		
3-14-2014	07-CV-05944	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>In re: CRT Antitrust Litigation</b></p> <p>The lawsuit claims that the Defendants conspired to fix, raise, maintain or stabilize prices of CRT Products resulting in overcharges to consumers who bought CRT Products such as Televisions and Computer Monitors.</p> <p>On 9-19-2013, the District Court ordered that the lawsuit could proceed as a class action on behalf of the Litigated Class. Class Members of the Litigated Class are described below:</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information call or visit:</p> <p>1-800-649-8153</p> <p><a href="http://www.CRTsettlement.com">www.CRTsettlement.com</a></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>(A) All persons or entities in Arizona, California, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia, or Wisconsin, who or which, as residents of those states, indirectly purchased for their own use and not for resale, from 3-1-1995 through 11-25-2007, any CRT Product made by the Defendants or their co-conspirators.</p> <p>(B) All persons or entities in the District of Columbia, who or which, as residents of the District of Columbia, indirectly purchased for their own use and not for resale, from 3-1-1995 through 11-25-2007, any CRT Product made by the Defendants or their co-conspirators.</p> <p>(C) All persons or entities in Hawaii who or which, as residents of Hawaii, indirectly purchased for their own use and not for resale, from 6-25-2002 through 11-25-2007, any CRT Product made by the Defendants or their co-conspirators.</p> <p>(D) All persons or entities in Nebraska who or which, as residents of Nebraska, indirectly purchased for their own use and not for resale, from 7-20-2002 through 11-25-2007, any CRT Product made by the Defendants or their co-conspirators.</p> <p>(E) All persons or entities in Nevada who or which, as residents of Nevada, indirectly</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			purchased for their own use and not for resale, from 2-4-1999 through 11-25-2007, any CRT Product made by the Defendants or their coconspirators.		
3-14-2014	13-CV-12721	(D. Mass.)	<p><b>Michael Pietrantonio v. Ann, Inc.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated Massachusetts law by requesting and recording Personal Identification Information, including, but not limited to, ZIP codes of customers who engaged in a credit card transaction.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who between 10-29-2009 and [Date of Preliminary Approval Order] used a Credit Card at a Massachusetts Ann Inc. Store, and Personal Identification Information, including, but not limited to ZIP code, was requested and recorded by Ann Inc. at the Massachusetts Ann Inc. Store.</p>	Not set yet	No information
3-17-2014	12-CV-02169	(S.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Sayan Aboudi v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc., et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that T-Mobile violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act by using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice to place Collections Calls to wireless phones without the prior express consent of the recipient.</p> <p>Class Members are all individuals in the United States who answered one or more collections Calls placed by T-Mobile to a wireless telephone number using an automatic telephone dialing system and not manually dialed, or an</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Todd M. Friedman Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C. 369 South Doheny Drive Suite 415 Beverly Hills, CA 90211</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			artificial/prerecorded voice ("ATDS Calls"), either directly, or indirectly through an outsourced vendor placing calls on T-Mobile's behalf between 9-4-2008 and 9-4-2012 and who: (a) are not current or former T-Mobile customers; (b) received collections calls from T-Mobile on a non-T-Mobile US wireless telephone number that was not provided to T-Mobile by the customer as a contact number; (c) did not consent to receive those calls; and (d) did not indicate that the call had reached the correct party.		
3-18-2014	13-CV-6836	(N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>Dr. William P. Gress v. Security Metrics, Inc.</b> Plaintiff alleges that SecurityMetrics, Inc. sent unsolicited facsimile advertisements promoting its goods and services for sale, and that the faxes did not contain an opt out notice as described in the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227. Plaintiff alleged that the sending of these faxes violated the TCPA, the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act and Illinois common law.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities with fax numbers who during the period 2-5-2009 through and including 2-28-2013, were sent faxes by or on behalf of SecurityMetrics which contained the letterhead or logo of NCMIC Financial Corporation, and which referred to or promoted the goods or services of SecurityMetrics and which do not contain an opt out notice as described in 47 U.S.C. § 227.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call, fax or visit:</p> <p>Edelman, Combs, Lattuner, &amp; Goodwin, LLC (27886) 120 S. LaSalle Street Suite 1800 Chicago, IL 60603</p> <p>312 739-4200 (Ph.) 312 419-0379 (Fax)</p> <p><a href="http://www.edcombs.com">www.edcombs.com</a></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-18-2014	10-CV-00378	(D. Del.)	<p><b>In re: Heckmann Corp. Sec. Litigation</b> Heckmann Corporation, Richard J. Heckmann, James Danforth Quayle, Alfred E. Osborne, Jr., Lou L. Holtz, Donald G. Ezzell, and China Water and Drinks, Inc. (collectively, Defendants).</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the federal securities laws by obtaining shareholder approval of the Merger by means of proxy solicitations that misrepresented China Water's operations, assets, and financial results, and omitted material information regarding known fraudulent conduct at China Water. The Amended Complaint also alleged that Defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omitted material facts about China Water and the Merger throughout the period 5-20-2008 through 5-8-2009, inclusive.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired Heckmann common stock or warrants during the Settlement Class Period (i.e., 5-20-2008 through 5-8-2009, inclusive) or who held Heckmann common stock as of the Record Date of 9-15-2008 and who held these shares through the Approval Date of 10-30-2008.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Sharan Nirmul Kessler Topaz Meltzer &amp; Check, LLP 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087</p>
3-20-2014	10-CV-2543	(S.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Harold Holmes v. NCO Financial Systems, Inc.</b> Plaintiff alleges that NCO improperly furnished information to credit reporting agencies regarding purported delinquent AT&amp;T accounts without reporting that the accounts had been</p>	6-23-2014	<p>For more information write to or Fax:</p> <p>David C. Parisi Parisi &amp; Havens LLP 212 Marine Street</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>previously disputed.</p> <p>Class Members all individuals whom NCO reported to a credit reporting agency as delinquent on an AT&amp;T account without noting that the account had been disputed, and the information stored in AT&amp;T OASIS systems indicated that another collection agency had previously marked that account as disputed before the account was assigned to NCO.</p>		<p>Santa Monica, CA 90405</p> <p>818 501-7852 (Fax)</p> <p>Ethan Preston Preston Law Office 8245 North 85<sup>th</sup> Way Scottsdale, Arizona 85258</p> <p>866 509-1197 (Fax)</p>
3-20-2014	08-CV-1713	(E.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>Plumbers' &amp; Pipefitters' Local #562 Supplemental Plan &amp; Trust, et al. v. J.P. Morgan Acceptance Corp. I, et al.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that on 3-26-2008, a class action complaint was filed against Defendants and certain other defendants in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Nassau County, Index No. 5675/08, on behalf of all persons or entities who acquired mortgage pass-through certificates and asset-backed pass-through certificates pursuant and/or traceable to certain registration statements and prospectus supplements, asserting certain claims under the Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Certificates pursuant or traceable to the Offerings and were damaged thereby.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Berger &amp; Grossmann LLP David r. Stickney Niki L. Mendoza 12481 High Bluff Drive Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92130</p> <p>Wolf Popper LLP Marian P. Rosner Matthew Insley-Pruitt 845 third Avenue 12<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10022</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-21-2014	07-MD-1840	(D. Kan.)	<p><b>In re: Motor Fuel Temperature Sales Practices Litigation</b></p> <p>These lawsuits are about whether the Companies misled consumers by failing to disclose the temperature of motor fuel or account for the temperature of the motor fuel when it was sold to consumers. Plaintiffs claim that adjusting for temperature in the sale of motor fuel is important because the volume of motor fuel changes as it heats up or cools down. Plaintiffs claim that because the Companies sell motor fuel for a specified price per gallon without disclosing or adjusting for temperature, do not adjust the amount of fuel excise tax recoupment passed on to consumers and engaged in a conspiracy to preclude the use of temperature compensation in retail motor fuel sales, they are liable under consumer protection laws and other laws in the States at issue.</p> <p>Class Members are defined below:</p> <p>For six (6) Settlements, you do not need to have purchased gasoline or diesel fuel from one of the companies in order to be a member of one of the classes.</p> <p>For the BP, CITGO, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobile, Shell and Sinclair Settlements, the class members are persons or entities who bought gasoline or diesel fuel at a gas station in any of the States at Issue from 1-1-2001 to [date of Preliminary Approval]. For these Settlements, you do not need to have purchased gasoline or</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Robert A. Horn Horn Aylward &amp; Bandy, LLC 2600 Grand Boulevard Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64108</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>diesel fuel from one of those Companies in order to be a member of one of the classes.</p> <p>For twenty-two (22) Settlement, you must have purchased motor fuel from the particular Company to be a class member for that Settlement:</p> <p>For the B-B Oil, Casey's, Coulson, Dansk, Diamond State, E-Z Mart Stores, Flash Market, G&amp;M, J&amp;P Flash, Magness, Love's, M.M. Fowler, Fort Cities, Sam's, Tesoro, Thorntons, Valero, and W.R. Hess Settlements, the Class Members for each Settlement are: all persons that bought gasoline or diesel fuel from that particular Company in any of the States at Issue from 1-1-2001 to [date of Preliminary Approval]. For these Settlements, you must have purchased motor fuel from a station owned, operated or controlled by one of these companies in order to be a class member in the Settlement for that particular Company.</p> <p>For the Chevron, G&amp;M, United, and World Settlements, the Class Members for each Settlement are: all persons and entities who bought gasoline or diesel fuel at a gas station owned, operated, or controlled by that particular company in one of the States at Issue from 1-1-2004 to [date of Preliminary Approval]. For these Settlements: you must have purchased gasoline or diesel fuel from a Company in order to be a Class Member in the Settlement for that particular company.</p>		

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-21-2014	13-CV-01302 13-CV-01159	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Zia Hicks, et al. v. Toys 'R' Us-Delaware, Inc. Nicolette Grana v. Toys 'R' Us-Delaware, Inc.</b> Plaintiffs allege that Toys 'R' Us violated the California Labor Code and Business &amp; Professional Code, including that Toys 'R' Us failed to provide appropriate meal and rest breaks and that Plaintiffs were not properly compensated for all hours worked.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who worked as a Sales Team Member, including without limitation the position of cashier, for Defendants in California within four years prior to the filing of this complaint until the date of certification.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write, call or e-mail</p> <p>Capstone Law APC Raul Perez 1840 Century Park East Suite 450 Los Angeles, CA 90067</p> <p>855 414-6105 (Ph.)</p> <p><a href="mailto:info@ToysRUsClassAction.com">info@ToysRUsClassAction.com</a></p>
3-21-2014	12-CV-6094	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>Trinidad v. Pret A Manger (USA) Ltd.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") and the New York Labor Law ("NYLL") by failing to pay non-exempt (hourly) employees for all the hours they worked, including applicable overtime pay for hours over forty in a work week, by improperly pooling tips, by failing to provide accurate wage statements and wage notices, and by failing to provide spread of hours, certain uniform-related costs, and call-in-pay, among other claims.</p> <p>Class Members are all who were employed by Pret as a team member, team member star, barista, team member trainer, kitchen team leader, shop team leader, team leader, or any other non-</p>	Not set yet	No information

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			exempt non-management store position in New York at any time from 8-9-2006 until [Preliminary Approval Date].		
3-21-2014	09-MD-2067	(D. Mass.)	<p><b>In re: Celexa &amp; Lexapro Marketing &amp; Sales Practices Litigation</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Forest violated the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act by misrepresenting the efficacy of Celexa® and Lexapro® for use by persons under the age of 18- in other words, Plaintiffs claim Defendants told people Celexa® and Lexapro® were effective in treating depression in those under 18 when it really wasn't.</p> <p>Class Members are of two parties:</p> <p>Individuals: are all individuals who purchased or paid for Celexa® or Lexapro® for use by a minor under the age of 18 between 1-1-1998 and 12-31-2013, <u>and</u> if either (i) Celexa® or Lexapro® was prescribed to the minor in Missouri; or (ii) payment for the prescription was made in Missouri; or (iii) you or the minor was a domiciliary citizen of Missouri at the time of the prescription or payment.</p> <p>Entities, including Third-Party Payers: are all who purchased paid for, or made a reimbursement for Celexa® or Lexapro® for use by a minor under the age of 18 between 1-1-1998 and 12-31-2013, <u>and</u> if either (i) Celexa® or Lexapro® was prescribed to the minor in Missouri or (ii) the minor was a domiciliary citizen of Missouri at</p>	7-9-2014	<p>For more information write, call or fax:</p> <p><b>Pendley, Baudin &amp; Coffin, LLP</b> 1515 Poydras Street Suite 1400 New Orleans, LA 70112</p> <p>225 687-6396 (Ph.)</p> <p>225 697-0577 (Fax)</p> <p><b>Baum, Hedlund, Aristei &amp; Goldman, P.C.</b> 12100 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 950 Los Angeles, CA 90025</p> <p>310 207-3233 (Ph.)</p> <p>310 820-7444 (Fax)</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			the time of the prescription or payment.		
4-24-2014	11-CV-07320	(S.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>Pierter Van Dongen v. CNinsure Inc., et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Defendant actively misrepresented and concealed from investors that a material portion of CNinsure's rapid growth and financial success was attributable to the Company's alleged payment of equitable incentive compensation. The Complaint asserts that these allegedly false and misleading statements and omissions artificially inflated the price of CNinsure American Depositary Shares ("ADSs").</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased CNinsure ADSs during the period from 3-3-2010 through and including 11-21-2011.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Robbins Geller Rudman &amp; Dowd LLP Ellen Gusikoff Stewart 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101</b></p>
3-24-2014	09-CV-04730	(E.D. Pa.)	<p><b>Western Pennsylvania Electrical Employees' Pension Fund v. Dennis Alter, et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Section 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by misrepresenting and omitting material facts about Advanta Corp.'s (Advanta) business, including its customer base, customer delinquencies, credit card re-pricing practices, loan loss reserves, and earnings. Plaintiff alleges that when Defendants disclosed the truth about Company's financial results, Class Members suffered damages as a result of the decline in the price of Advanta Class A and/or Class B common stock.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Jeffrey D. Light Robbins Geller Rudman &amp; Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 2900 San Diego, CA 92101</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			otherwise acquired Advanta Class A and/or Class B common stock between 10-16-2006 and 1-30-2008, inclusive.		
3-24-2014	09-CV-01811	(N.D. Ga.)	<p><b>City of Pompano Beach General Employees' Retirement System, v. Synovus Financial Corp., Richard E. Anthony, Frederick L. Green III, Thomas J. Prescott and Mark G. Holladay "Defendants"</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants issued materially false and misleading statements regarding the company's business and financial results. Defendants engaged in improper behavior which harmed Synovus's investors by failing to disclose the extent of its large exposure to the Sea Island Company ("Sea Island"), a resort in Georgia, and the deteriorating condition of Sea Island. The Company also failed to adequately and timely record losses for its impaired loans, causing its financial results to be materially false.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Synovus common stock between 10-26-2007 and 4-22-2009, inclusive.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Susan E. Hurd Alston &amp; Bird LLP One Atlantic Center 1201 West Peachtree Street Atlanta, GA 30309</p>
3-27-2014	13-CV-07945	(N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>Lambert v. Tallabs, Inc., et al.</b></p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that members of the Tallabs board of directors breached their fiduciary duties to Tallabs shareholders in connection with Tallabs' sales process and the Merger, including by allegedly failing to undertake an adequate sale process, obtaining an unfair and</p>	7-17-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p>Juan E. Monteverde Faruqi &amp; Faruqi LLP 369 Lexington Avenue 10<sup>th</sup> Floor</p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>inadequate price, engaging in self-dealing, including various "deal protection devices," and failing to disclose to the company's shareholders information necessary to make an informed decision with respect to the Merger. The lawsuit also claims that the Schedule 14D-9 filed by Tellabs in connection with the Merger contained misleading or otherwise inadequate disclosures in violation of certain federal securities laws and alleged state law fiduciary duties.</p> <p>Class Members are all record holders or beneficial owners of shares of Tallabs common stock at any time beginning on and including 10-18-2013 through 12-2-2013.</p>		New York, NY 10003
3-28-2014	13-CV-00864	(C.D. Cal.)	<p><b>John Doe One, et al. v. UnitedHealthcare Insurance Company, et al.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that United's requirement that members obtain their HIV/AIDS Specialty Medications on an in-network basis from the Specialty Pharmacy by mail violated state and federal statutes, regulations and rights of privacy, including ERISA, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the California Unruh Act (the "Lawsuit"). This lawsuit seeks relief barring United from engaging in conduct pertaining to the Program that Plaintiffs allege violates such laws as applied to persons diagnosed with HIV/AIDS, monetary relief, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.</p> <p>Class Members include each person who has been</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Edith M. Kallas</b>  <b>Whatley Kallas LLP</b>  <b>1180 Avenue of the Americas</b>  <b>20<sup>th</sup> Floor</b>  <b>New York, NY 10036</b></p> <p><b>Jerry Flanagan</b>  <b>Consumer Watchdog</b>  <b>2701 Ocean Park Blvd.</b>  <b>Suite 112</b>  <b>Santa Monica, Cal. 90405</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
			<p>diagnosed as having HIV and AIDS ("HIV/AIDS"), who is or has in the past been prescribed a medication that the Specialty Pharmacy identifies as a medication for the treatment of HIV/AIDS, who does not opt out of the class defined in the Order of Preliminary Approval and who, as of the date of this Agreement, (i) is enrolled in or covered by any health plan offered or administered by United or its Affiliates that includes a prescription drug benefit, including but not limited to insured and self-funded ERISA plans, individual plans, governmental plans, and church or group plans, (ii) is prescribed HIV/AIDS Specialty Medications, and (iii) is required to participate in the Program.</p>		
3-28-2014	10-CV-00648	(D. Nev.)	<p><b>Elliott v. China Green Agriculture, et al.</b> Plaintiff alleges that China Green Agriculture ("CGA") and certain of its officers and directors made false and misleading statements in CGA's public filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission in violation of federal securities laws. On 4-27-2011, the Court appointed a group of purported CGA shareholders as Lead Plaintiffs.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons or entities who purchased or otherwise acquired CGA securities between 5-12-2009 and 1-4-2011, inclusive.</p>	7-22-2014	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Joseph e. White, III Saxena White P.A. 2424 N. Federal Highway Suite 257 Boca Raton, FL 33431</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-28-2014	10-MD-02143	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>In re: Optical Disk Drive Products Antitrust Litigation ("ODD")</b>  Plaintiff alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of ODDs for six years, resulting in overcharges to direct purchasers of those ODDs and certain products containing ODDs. The complaint describes how the Defendants and co-conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. antitrust laws by establishing a global cartel that set artificially high prices for, and restricted the supply of ODDs.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who from 1-1-2004 until at least 1-1-2010 directly purchased an ODD in the United States from any Defendant or subsidiary or affiliate thereof, or any co-conspirator ("Settlement Class"). As used herein the term "ODD" includes (a) a drive sold by a Defendant or its subsidiary or affiliate as a separate unit that is to be inserted into, or incorporated in, an electronic device; (b) a drive sold by Defendant or its subsidiary or affiliate as a separate unit that is to be attached to an electronic device through an external interface such as a Universal Serial Bus connection; and (c) an internal drive sold as a component of a laptop or desktop computer by a Defendant or its subsidiary or affiliate.</p>	Not set yet	For more information visit:  <a href="http://www.ODDDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com">www.ODDDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com</a>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name  Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-28-2014	13-CV-1-56	(E.D. Va.)	<p><b>Joseph, et al. v. the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., (BNA) et al.</b>            Plaintiffs claim that Defendants improperly misled investors during the Class Period 3-21-2011 through 8-25-2011, by misrepresenting the fair value of BNA stock; by misrepresenting and concealing material information relating to the sale of BNA; and by engaging in insider trading.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons who sold BNA stock through the BNA SPTP from 3-21-2011 through 8-25-2011, and received \$17.50 per share for their BNA stock.</p>	Not set yet	No information
3-28-2014	11-CV-520	(W.D. Okla.)	<p><b>Northumberland County Retirement System and Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System</b>            Plaintiffs allege that the price of GMX common stock issued in the Company's 5-2009 and 10-2009 Offerings was artificially inflated as a result of materially untrue statements contained in the offering materials for each of the Offerings concerning the accuracy and integrity of GMX's financial statements, as well as the adequacy of the Company's internal controls over financial reporting.</p> <p>Class Members are all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired GMX common stock pursuant or traceable to the 5-2009 Offering or 10-2009 Offering.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information write to:</p> <p><b>Michael K. Yarnoff            Kessler Topaz Meltzer &amp; Check, LLP            280 King of Prussia Road            Radnor, PA 19087</b></p>

**Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) Notices  
in March, 2014 to the  
Attorney General for the District of Columbia**

Notice Date	Case Number	Court	Case Name Summary of Issue	Fairness Hearing Date	Website Link
3-31-2014	12-CV-06027	(N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>Shahar v. Hotwire, Inc. ("Hotwire")</b> Plaintiff and additional Hotwire customers rented vehicles for use outside the United States, were given confirmations that improperly estimated the amount of taxes and fees for their rental would be zero, and then were charged taxes and insurance fees by the rental car agency when they picked up the rented vehicle.</p> <p>Class Members are all entities and persons in the United States (including its territories and the District of Columbia) who, during the Class Period (11-27-2008 to the present), made a reservation through Hotwire's website, while in the U.S. (including its territories and the District of Columbia), for a car rental in a foreign country and receive a confirmation from Hotwire that included an estimated amount of taxes or fees equal to or less than \$0.00 as shown by records maintained by Hotwire and provided to class counsel on the Spreadsheet.</p>	Not set yet	<p>For more information email or call:</p> <p><b>Cory Fein</b> <a href="mailto:csf@caddellchapman.com">csf@caddellchapman.com</a></p> <p>877 553-3058 (Ph.)</p>